DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 920 88 PS 008 921

AUTHOR John, Thomas
TITLE Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents: An Evaluation Study. Final Report.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 76
CONTRACT 0684-AA-MS-0-6-GA
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; *Early Childhood Education; Evaluation Methods; Family Environment; Home Programs; Learning Activities; Low Income Groups; *Outreach Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Education; Parent Participation; Parent Role; Parent School Relationship; *Preschool Programs; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; Role Models; Teacher Attitudes; Tutors
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; *Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluation study and final report on the Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents (LECOPP), a program implemented to correct educational problems among children in low-income families. Conducted from August 1975 through July 1976 at the Lenox Elementary School, the program focused primarily on training the parent to regularly provide informal learning experiences in the home for children from 2.9 to 3.9 years old who were eligible for prekindergarten classes the following September. The follow objectives of the program were established: (1) project children will achieve better in school, (2) the home environment will be reinforcing to the school environment, (3) teachers will work cooperatively with parents in pinpointing and meeting children's needs, (4) tutors will serve as models for parents as teachers and introduce preschool children to activities for increasing readiness skills, (5) parent-teacher aides will provide valuable assistance in the Child-Parent Center and serve as liaison between staff and community, and (6) the project director will assist parents in modifying their expectations so that school and home goals are more harmonious. Evaluation methods and procedures are described and teacher questionnaire and parent survey response findings are reported. Conclusions and recommendations are discussed. Appendices include both questionnaires. (MS)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PS

ED131920

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ESEA TITLE III EVALUATION - FINAL REPORT

LECOP-P

Lenox Early Childhood
Outreach Program/Parents

PS008921

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
August 1976

Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents

An Evaluation Study

Final Report

Thomas John, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

Coordinated Under the
Division of Planning, Research
& Evaluation, Room 1013
415 12th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Contract No. 0684-AA-MS-0-6-GA

July 15, 1976

Acknowledgements

The project staff would
like to acknowledge their appreciation to:

The Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Mr. Vincent Reed
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Mildred Cooper
Assistant Superintendent for Division of Research & Evaluation

Mrs. Lavolia Vails
Coordinator for Title III Project Evaluation

Mrs. Elsa Miller
Ms. Patricia Goins
Title III Advisory Council Chairperson & Co-Chairperson

Mr. Harris M. Taylor
Director of Federal Programs

Mrs. Grace Davis
Coordinator for ESEA Title III Projects

Dr. Jennie Gross
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Description of the Project	1
	-- Objectives	6
2.	Evaluation Methods and Procedures	7
3.	Findings of the Study	9
	-- I. Teacher Questionnaire Findings	9
	-- II. Parent Survey Response	16
4.	Conclusions and Recommendations	27
5.	Appendices	35
	-- Appendix A Parent Questionnaire	36
	-- Appendix B Teacher Questionnaire	39
	-- Appendix C Developmental Checklist	42
	-- Appendix D Abbreviated Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale	43

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Teacher Ratings of the LECOPP Program . . .	10
Table 2 Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Improvement in LECOPP Students	12
Table 3 Number & Percentage of Parental Representation By School Districts	17
Table 4 Major Skills Learned By Parents Through LECOPP	18
Table 5 Special Features of LECOPP Parents Liked Most .	19
Table 6 Frequency and Percentage of Parental Response to Child Growth Items	21 22
Table 7 Parent Opinion of LECOPP	24
Table 8 Recommendations to Improve the Program and Other Comments	26

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents (LECOPP), conducted from August 1, 1975 to July 31, 1976 at the Lenox Elementary School, focused primarily on training the parent to provide on a regular basis informal learning experiences in the home for children from 2.9 to 3.9 years old, who were eligible for prekindergarten classes the following September. The learning experiences imparted from parent to child were designed to mature perceptual, motor and cognitive functions in a way which approximated the learning accomplished through successful mother-child relationships. All parent-child instruction in the program was casual, informal and repetitive, and involved reading to the child, supervision of puzzle and block-building activities, sorting tasks, comparison, observation, enumeration, song and positive and informal responsiveness to child questions. The Alpha Time and other developmental materials were used by tutorial trainees to establish rapport by engaging in incidental game-play. After an initial two month period of in-home tutorial, the approximately 60 parents who worked with their children through the program were encouraged to visit a Child-Parent Center at least once

a week to work with the teaching staff on developmentally arranged perceptual and cognitive tasks.

The larger goal of the project was to provide parents with the expertise to develop in their children basic perceptual skills necessary for meaningful development in a formalized prekindergarten and kindergarten school situation. The program attempted to nurture the potential of students from low-income, inner-city backgrounds by developing adequate perceptual, motor and verbal cognitive skills during the critical developmental period between ages two and five.

The rationale behind the program was based on the observation, by Piaget and others, that formal schooling alone cannot compensate for the lack of stimulation in the home provided by the essential roles mothers play to their pre-school children. Studies by Abbott and Sabatino, for example, demonstrated that by having low-income mothers function as teachers of their pre-school academic high-risk children, these significant gains were made: increased IQ scores, gains on the Frostig Test of Visual Perception, increased child confidence and the improved ability to listen to and follow directions.

The LECOPP program was implemented to correct educational problems among low-income children. The methodology of the program involved an attempt to alert low-income families to the educational needs of their young children by including them in the school's activities and extending the purpose of the formal school situation into the home.

Sample program activities with children included: drawing, cutting, coloring, pasting, completing simple puzzles, designating over/under, up/down, before/after, naming body parts and concrete items found in the living room, the kitchen, schoolroom and street, and training children to answer their age and sex when asked.
Sample program activities with parents included: the development of home-teaching activities, projects and activities involving family togetherness, training in story telling through reading and flannel board activities, projects correlating home and school, the development of a school newspaper containing parent and center news, and developmental lessons in listening, speaking, perceptual and motor skills, mathematics and classifications so that parents might have an understanding of basic concepts

motivating to children through their natural curiosity.

Twice weekly for not more than a half hour tutors taught LECOPP parents how to help their children with the following: shape recognition, color discrimination, vocabulary development, classification, tactile discrimation, hand-eye coordination, motor skill development and oral communications. Activities that were observed by parents in the Child-Parent Center were as follows:

1.) observed guided lessons in listening, oral communication and percpetual motor skill training;
2.) observed and participated in all activities performed with children;
3.) coordinated and planned follow-up activities such as rhythmic games;
4.) helped develop conceptual booklets for the children;
5.) planned field trips;
6.) trained groups of children in particular skills;
7.) constructed peek-boxes and touch-me books;
8.) performed finger plays with children;
9.) played catch using bean bags/balls;
10.) trained to perform all CPC activities.

The LECOPP project attempted during its first year to develop a closer relationship between parents and the

school; to demonstrate to parents their potential for helping their children develop; to instill confidence in children to develop a belief in themselves and their worth as individuals through participation in an informal training environment. Significantly, the success of the program depended greatly on parental cooperation; family crises or disinterested non-cooperation could simply curtail at its inception the positive results in child perceptual, motor and cognitive development intended by the program.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were established for the Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents:

1.) project children will achieve better in school after sharing their first school experiences with their parents in the training program;

2.) the home environment will be reinforcing to the school environment and the number of low-achieving children will have been reduced by parental use of family resources to maximize the potential of those children;

3.) teachers will work cooperatively with parents in pinpointing children's needs and meeting those needs;

4.) tutors will serve as models for parents as teachers and introduce the pre-school children to activities designed to increase readiness skills;

5.) parent-teacher aides will provide valuable assistance in the Child-Parent Center and will serve as a liaison between the staff and the community;

6.) the project director will assist the parents in modifying their expectations so that school and home goals can become harmonious.

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION METHODS & PROCEDURES

The formative evaluation of the project had four main objectives, namely:

1. To describe and assess the extent to which pre-kindergarten, low-income, inner-city children increased their proficiency in the perceptual, motor, and verbal skills associated with successful school learning;
2. To describe and assess the types and frequency of parental involvement in activities designed to help their children develop school readiness skills;
3. To determine the overall effectiveness of the project in providing the children with informal learning experiences through increased parental training and cooperative efforts with teachers;
4. To prepare an interim report and a final report that will provide the following information to program planners and operating staff:
    - A.) Clear and concise information about the program and its salient characteristics;
    - B.) Practical recommendations that seem warranted in such areas as (1) strengthening parental involvement in the program, (2) improving the kinds and sequencing of the readiness activities for children and parents, and (3) improving the organization for and service delivery of the program.

In order to achieve these objectives, the evaluators have used the internal evaluation provided by the project director, a Teacher/Teacher Aide/Director's Questionnaire, a Parent Questionnaire, on-site visitation by the project director, interviews with parents, teachers, project directors and support staff, and any available records at the project office. Copies of the major instruments are attached as appendices. Each of these instruments was carefully administered to avoid biases and to maximize returns.

All interviews and observations were conducted by the project director to assure maximum reliability of the data.

Results of the Abbreviated Henderson Environmental Learning Process Scale for parents and the Developmental Check-list for children (used by the project staff for quantitative evaluation) were not obtained for inclusion in this report. However, the tests are included in the appendices.

The project evaluator visited Lenox Elementary School roughly six times from April through May 1976 to conduct on-site observations and interviews with parents and project staff. At each visit new data was collected and often cross-validated with old data obtained through the instrumentation process. To maximize returns, questionnaires were hand-carried to the school and personally collected by the project director.

No samples were selected for the questionnaires. With the exception of parent samples used for the interviews, the total population was small enough to be properly used at all other instances of data collection.

CHAPTER 3

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

I. Teacher Questionnaire Findings

During the year, the staff included one teacher-coordinator, one teacher-tutor and three teacher-aides. However, of those five involved in the program, only three completed and returned the questionnaire.

The program coordinator was an experienced teacher having the expertise needed to train and direct parents, as well as the tutor and the teacher aides. The innovative methods developed by the coordinator were adopted by parents for working at home with their children, and set the tone of the program throughout the year. In working with their children at home parents also used, with great success, instructional materials developed in the program.

Teacher ratings of various aspects of the LECOPP program are enumerated in Table 1.

The numbers in the table represent the ratings of a teacher, a tutor and a teacher-aide for the particular items listed. Since only three of the five teachers completed the questionnaire, percentage calculations in this case were deemed unnecessary as well as possibly distorting. Therefore, percentages were not calculated for this group.

Table 1

Teacher Ratings of the LECOPP Program

	Excellent	Good	Average
Parental Involvement	2	1	-
Parental Interest	2	1	-
Family Participation	2	-	1
Teacher Parent Cooperation	3	-	-
Materials and Supplies	-	1	2
Parent Training	1	2	-
Home Visitation	1	1	1
Daily Schedule of Activities	2	1	-
Facilities	1	2	-

A 5-point scale was used to rate the program. Since none of the respondents rated any item less than "average," the table includes only the three highest ratings on the scale.

Two of the respondents rated the parental involvement, parental interest, community participation, and the daily schedule of activities as excellent. All three teachers indicated that teacher parent cooperation was excellent.

The lowest rating, with two "averages" and one "good," was made in the area of materials and supplies. Although the project was conducted on a small scale that minimized the demand for supplies and materials, administrative delays in

obtaining necessary items seems to have had moderately adverse effects upon project operations.

Both the parental training program and classroom facilities received high ratings from the respondents, with two "good" and one "excellent" rating each. Although these ratings indicate an encouraging response during the initial year of program operation, a lack of concurrence in the area of home visitation suggests that teachers either were somewhat unclear about the specifics of the home visitations or that they were, to an extent, dissatisfied with procedures initiated for this component of the entire project. Ratings for home visitation were evenly divided, with one vote each in the three response categories, "excellent," "good," and "average."

Teachers were generally confident of student improvement to a "great extent" in a majority of the traits listed on the questionnaire. A complete enumeration of the frequency of teacher responses for each trait is listed in Table 2. Teacher opinion seems to indicate that the program was beneficial to the student population at large, since the response category, "no extent," was left completely blank. In the opinion of teacher respondents, students improved at least to some extent in all traits.

However, teacher opinion represented in Table 2 also indicates that LECOPP students did not master all skills equally well or to the same extent.

Table 2

Teacher Ratings of the Extent of Improvement In LECOPP Students

	Great Extent	Medium Extent	No Extent
a) Vocabulary	3	-	-
b) Understanding problems	1	2	-
c) Asking sensible questions	1	2	-
d) Cooperating with others	2	1	-
e) Physical activities in school	2	1	-
f) Personal manners	2	1	-
g) Discipline in the class	3	-	-
h) Color recognition	3	-	-
i) Number recognition	1	2	-
j) Shape recognition	3	-	-
k) Singing songs	3	-	-
l) Dancing to rhythm	2	1	-
m) Finding own solutions to problems	-	3	-
n) Observing things and events	3	-	-
o) Relating stories or incidents	2	1	-
p) Good table manners	1	2	-
q) Language	3	-	-
r) Playing new games	3	-	-
s) Understand directions for classroom activities	1	2	-
t) Attitude toward school	3	-	-
u) Interest in coming to school	3	-	-
v) Overall child development	3	-	-
w) Other (Specify)-- Ability to share & live together with dignity	2	-	-

Teachers indicated the greatest amount of student improvement in the areas of: vocabulary, discipline, color recognition, shape recognition, singing songs, observing things and events, language, new games, attitude toward school, interest in coming to school, and overall development of the child.

Student improvement was more moderate in the areas of: understanding problems, asking sensible questions, number recognition, finding own solutions to problems, good table manners, and understanding directions for classroom activities. Although teacher response indicates the program's greater success in the affective areas, where there is the most student improvement in perceptual and motor skills, some teachers were equally enthusiastic about their student's improvement in other areas, and indicated that improvement in these other areas was also to a "great extent." Consensus of opinion is affirmative with some variation in teacher response.

While a majority of teachers found improvement to a great extent in the areas of cooperating with others, physical activities in school, personal awareness, dancing to rhythm and relating stories or incidents, some teachers discerned only some improvement in the same areas.

Other student improvement to a great extent was specified as the ability to share and the ability to live together with dignity.

Unfortunately, the data provided in Table 2 is insufficient to draw final conclusions about specific areas of the program curriculum. Teacher opinion is especially paradoxical in the area of verbal skills. Both vocabulary and language received the highest rating from all three responding teachers, which suggests that the program is highly effective in the area of verbal skills. Yet, if this were entirely the case, the ability to understand verbal classroom directions and phrase questions should have received a more enthusiastic response from teachers. The inclusion of more items relating to verbal skills in the list of traits for appraisal might have allowed for a more decisive conclusion in this area.

All three teachers agreed that instructional materials developed by parents at home and under the supervision of the teacher-coordinator were generally excellent. Finally, Table 2 signifies definite student improvement in the program, according to the opinion of three project teachers.

Program teachers strongly recommended the continuation of LECOPP. One teacher, who worked with parents and their children during the 1975-76 academic year, enthusiastically praised the valuable role parents were asked to play in the LECOPP program: "After ten months of experience with this program, I have seen parents come to the realization that they really have a part in this society. Our society needs individuals who can help to develop the minds of children; therefore, this program needs to be continued."

According to teachers, some of the salient achievements of the program include: community cooperation, parental involvement in learning new techniques for instruction of their children, and successful cooperation and understanding among the young students.

II. Parent Survey Response

The parent response to the survey was similar to the teacher response in many ways. Most parents reacted favorably to the program and seemed to be enthusiastic about program activities. 24 (54.5%) of the 44 parents originally enrolled in the program, participated in the survey. Many of those parents who did not respond to the survey had curtailed active participation sometime before the end of the school year.

Respondents are those who participated most actively in the program throughout the year. 29 of the original 44 parents did not have their own children enrolled in the program, but helped develop instructional materials for LECOPP at home. Only 2 parents who completed the questionnaire did not have a child or grandchild in the program.

Parent respondents represent eight school district areas: from Lenox, John Tyler, Ruth Webb, Brent, Seaton, Buchanan, Watkins and Edmonds Elementary Schools. While a majority of the parents came from the immediate Lenox neighborhood, parental interest in the program was spread over a wide geographical area.

At the end of the 1975-76 school year, approximately 75% of parent participants were involved in the program for one year or less. By and large parents were informed of the program's existence by friends, teachers or relatives, although some came into the program after their own personal investigation.

Table 3

Number & Percentage of Parental Representation By School Districts

	# of Parents	% of Parents
Lenox	14	58.2
John Tyler	2	8.3
Ruth Webb	1	4.2
Brent	1	4.2
Seaton	1	4.2
Buchanan	1	4.2
Watkins	1	4.2
Edmonds	1	4.2
No Response	2	8.3
Total	24	100.

N = 24

Table 4

Major Skills Learned By Parents Through LECOPP

Skills	Frequency	Percentage
Developing Teaching Aids	21	87.5
Games and Play for Children	23	95.8
Teamwork with Other Parents and Teachers	24	100.0
Learning Child Behavior	22	91.7
Arranging Group Functions	13	54.2
Teaching Activities	20	83.3
Disciplining Children	19	79.2
Singing Songs	24	100.0
Other	1	4.2

N = 24

Table 5

Special Features of LECOPP Parents Liked Most

	Frequency	Percentage
1. Working with Children	10	41.7
2. Early Training	3	12.5
3. Entire Program	3	12.5
4. Parents and Children Program	2	8.3
5. Teamwork with Parents and Children	2	8.3
6. Teachers Coming Into the Home	2	8.3
7. Togetherness of Children and Parents	1	4.2
8. Needed in the Community	1	4.2

N = 24

A majority of parents (41.7%) appreciated most the opportunity that LECOPP afforded them in working with their own children. LECOPP provided parents with expert and systematic guidance to appreciate the role they might play in facilitating children in their mastery of important, fundamental study skills. Table 5 lists other major features of LECOPP in the order of their importance to parents.

Only 21% of the parental respondents believed that the project needed to be changed, to provide for additional materials or the implementation of the program in other schools. 79% of the parents either had no opinion or opposed making any changes in the program.

Parents provided revealing insights into their enthusiasm for the program, when they were asked to identify the changes they noticed in their children. Table 6 lists the frequency and percentage of parent responses to items indicating various aspects of child growth.

The four areas in which a majority of parents noticed changes were: "observe things more" (87.5%), "plays with other children" (87.5%), "interested in school" (87.5%) and "learned more words" (83.3%). The remaining behavioral changes received a positive response from 50% or more of the parents.

Approximately 17% of parents reported additional characteristics such as: "sitting still," "recognizing things," "interested in cutting and pasting," and "lost shyness." Table 6 signifies that LECOPP children have attained substantial skill in perceptual, motor and verbal areas during their participation in the program throughout the school year. LECOPP also increased parental involvement in assisting children in the development of proper readiness skills.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Parental Response to Child Growth Items

	Frequency	Percentage
1. Answer questions faster.	16	66.7
2. Observe things more.	21	87.5
3. More active.	17	70.8
4. Dance to rhythm.	18	75.0
5. Plays with other children.	21	87.5
6. Speaks in complete sentence.	13	54.2
7. Recognizes shapes.	17	70.8
8. Completes puzzles.	14	58.3
9. Sings songs.	21	87.5
10. Ask inquisitive questions.	17	70.8
11. Finds solutions to own problems.	7	29.2
12. Obeys better.	18	75.0
13. Understands problems better.	14	58.3
14. Good table manners.	17	70.8
15. Does coloring well.	13	54.2
16. Interested in school.	21	87.5
17. Recognizes colors.	18	75.0
18. Understands the names of different parts of the body.	17	70.8
19. Runs faster.	13	54.2
20. Learned more words.	20	83.3

N = 24

Table 6 (Continued)

Frequency and Percentage of Parental Response to Child Growth Items

	Frequency	Percentage
21. Does not depend on me as much.	16	66.7
22. Others (please list)		
1. Recognize things better in LECOPP	1	4.2
2. Sitting still	1	4.2
3. Interest in cutting and pasting	1	4.2
4. Lost shyness	1	4.2

N = 24

A frequency of 1 (4.2%) no response was made for each item.

Table 7 indicates a high degree of enthusiasm for the innovative LECOPP program. 70% or more of the parental respondents rated 6 (40%) of the 15 different program aspects as "excellent": parental training, LECOPP teacher coordinator, parental involvement, parent-teacher cooperation, team work, and teacher aides. Program aspects that received the highest parental scores were those items that most facilitated the maximum amount of participation by parents.

The areas of food and field trips received the lowest parental ratings. However, 66.6% of all parent respondents rated field trips either "good" or "excellent," and only one parent rated them as poor. Furthermore, this item received no response from 3 (12.5%) parents, indicating that it is perceived as being less vital to the well-being of the program than other items. 54.2% of all parental respondents rated food either "good" or "excellent," and no parents rated this item as poor. Again, 3 (12.5%) parents did not respond to this aspect of the program.

Project personnel received excellent ratings from a majority of the parental respondents. 15 (62.5%) of the parents rated the performance of the project director "excellent." 20 (83.3%) of the parents rated the performance of teacher-coordinators "excellent." Parents were more apt to have furthered acquaintance with teacher-coordinators than with the director through participation in the program. 13 (54.2%) parents rated the LECOPP tutor-secretary "excellent."

Table 7

Parent Opinion of LECOPP

	Excellent		Good		Average		Below Average		Poor		No Respo	
1. Parental training	19	79.2	3	12.5	1	4.2	-	-	-	-	1	4.
2. LECOPP teacher-coordinator	20	83.3	4	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. LECOPP director	15	62.5	4	16.7	2	8.3	-	-	-	-	3	12.
4. LECOPP tutor-secretary	13	54.2	3	12.5	6	25.0	-	-	-	-	2	8.
5. Space	13	54.2	6	25.0	3	12.5	1	4.2	1	4.2	-	-
6. Instructional materials	10	41.7	10	41.7	3	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	4.
7. Parental involvement	18	75.0	4	16.7	2	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Home visits by LECOPP teachers	10	41.7	4	16.7	5	20.8	1	4.2	-	-	4	16.
9. Parent-teacher cooperation	17	70.8	6	25.0	1	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Team work	17	70.8	6	25.0	1	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. Community involvement	11	45.8	5	20.8	5	20.8	1	4.2	-	-	2	8.
12. Teacher-aides	18	75.0	3	12.5	3	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Field trips	8	33.3	8	33.3	4	16.7	-	-	1	4.2	3	12.
14. Food	4	16.7	9	37.5	8	33.3	-	-	-	-	3	12.
15. Daily schedule of activities	15	62.5	8	33.3	1	4.2	-	-	-	-	3	12.
16. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

No project personnel received ratings of below average or poor, and no teacher-coordinators received ratings of less than good.

Overall parental rating of the LECOPP program is good to excellent. Approximately 50% of all parent respondents did not have any suggestions for improvement, indicating a high degree of satisfaction with existing project procedures and strategies for educating the young with the assistance of parents. Table 8 provides a complete listing of parental recommendations for improving the program. For the most part parental recommendations pertain to increasing the extent of the existing program to include more finances, field trips, days of the program, aides and materials. 2 parents suggested that parents should be hired to participate in the program.

Further comment by parents was especially positive. Parents commented that the teacher discipline was commendable, that they were proud of the program and that they were impressed by the coordinator's ability.

Table 8

Recommendations to Improve the Program

	Frequency	Percentage
1. No Response	12	50.0
2. Finances for Program	1	4.2
3. More Field Trips	1	4.2
4. Continue the Program	2	8.3
5. More Days of Program	1	4.2
6. Hire Parents	2	8.3
7. More aides	2	8.3
8. Additional Materials	3	12.5

Other Comments

	Frequency	Percentage
1. No Response	21	87.5
2. Teacher Discipline Commendable	1	4.2
3. Proud of the Program	1	4.2
4. Impressed by the Coordinator's Ability	1	4.2

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings, several recommendations are in order. These recommendations are positive and intended to further enhance the worthwhile aspects of the program during the coming year.

1.) The LECOPP program has captured the heart and soul of parents and the extended community within the very short duration of its operation. No one associated with the program seems to be dissatisfied; in fact, the consensus of opinion is overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the program activities for this innovative pre-school program. It is, therefore, recommended that LECOPP be continued for the next year with a full staff and well-coordinated activities.

2.) Parental involvement was the primary factor for the successful operation of LECOPP throughout the school year. Parental participation was well-motivated and dedicated to the performance of the parental role in facilitating pre-schoolers in the essential preparation for academic achievement in a formal learning environment. Parents provided children with assistance on a one-to-one basis that gave impetus to an increased learning pace and reenforced the entire learning process. Some parents voluntarily participated in the program throughout the school year, everyday of the school week, without any monetary support. Nominal remuneration is presently

provided for only two of the parent aides participating in the program. It is, therefore, recommended that parents who participate on a daily, in-school basis in the instruction of children be paid an incentive wage at a level no less than that wage set as a minimum by the District of Columbia. An incentive wage will be a motivating factor for participation by some parents. Of greater importance, however, is the fiscal assistance that an incentive wage would provide for parents who otherwise could not provide their valuable talent and time to participation in the program. Incumbent upon the introduction of an incentive wage into the program, the present "bus token" system of parent transportation should be curtailed. These changes in the present system of parental remuneration would tend to charge parents with even greater responsibility within the program.

3.) An imaginative and dedicated teacher coordinator and a talented project director are chief assets to the program. The efficient progress of the program during the last year can largely be attributed to the interest and initiative taken by these two educators. Their achievement includes: the improvisation of materials and resources when funds were not available to procure necessary supplies and equipment; the motivation of the program staff to maximize efforts, even when some of them were not receiving their monthly salary; and the inspiration of both parents and children through careful presentation of imaginative and valuable ideas and suggestions.

However, no provision was made in the budget for in service training for the project director, the teacher coordinator and the rest of the staff, when such a training component would have increased the effectiveness of the faculty effort. Staff members encountered extreme difficulty in obtaining travel approval to attend professional conventions important for staff development of innovative teaching methods. It is, therefore, recommended that provision be made in the budget for at least two in-service training periods and one professional conference for project staff during the coming year. In-service training can be arranged within the school building by inviting competent consultants to provide meaningful on-the-job training within a relatively short period of time.

4.) Although the LECOPP project was provided with a reasonable budget, the project director and her staff encountered difficulties in the expenditure of budget monies for many reasons. Budget sanction was obtained later than expected; orders placed for materials and supplies were not approved on time or sometimes were misplaced; ordered materials often never arrived. For these and a host of other similar reasons, it was impossible for the project staff to take full advantage of monies authorized for the project. Furthermore, the tutor-secretary was not paid a salary for the services she rendered to LECOPP. These fiscal problems were unnecessary as well as frustrating, and could have been avoided through the institution of more workable fiscal policies for the

the project. It is, therefore, recommended that the LECOPP project funds be kept separate from the regular D.C. Public Schools appropriations; and that an account be established in a local bank from which the project director, with the express authorization of the D.C. Schools Procurement Office, could draw monies for expenditures required by project related needs. New fiscal policies for project management in the D.C. Public School System may be required to implement this sort of fiscal autonomy.

5.) Project funds should be made available early in the school year so that all the necessary supplies and materials can be acquired before the start of the school year and to allow for program operation from the first day of classes.

6.) Presently, students are not selected for participation in the program according to any selection criteria. Interested parents who have somehow heard about the program contact the school to enroll their children. This sort of a selection process often fails to reach the most deserving children. It is, therefore, recommended that specific selection criteria be established for children and their parents, and that these criteria be printed in the brochure announcing the continuation of LECOPP in the next school year. This mode of publicity should attract more deserving and interested parents and children to the program.

7.) Home-study centers are an interesting and especially innovative aspect of the LECOPP program. Project staff

members visit the homes of children whose parents cannot come to the school on a daily basis. The tutor-secretary visits these parents on a regular basis for the purpose of dispensing teaching materials and new instructional ideas devised by the project staff. The home-study center component of the program provides an invaluable service to parents and children by enabling the maximum dissemination of information to the LECOPP population. However, one tutor-secretary is insufficient to meet the needs of approximately 30 parents and their children. It is, therefore, recommended that a second full-time tutor be hired to work with parents at home. This person should be properly trained by the coordinator and the present tutor-secretary before being sent out into the field. An active LECOPP parent might be especially well-suited to this new position.

8.) Child proficiency in perceptual, motor and verbal skills was measured by means of Criterion Referenced Tests administered by the school psychologist. However, the results of the pre and post tests were not available to the evaluation team, when the growth level achieved by project children was of special importance in coming to some conlusions about the degree of progress efficated by project methods and procedures of instruction. Although both observation and interview techniques of evaluation have revealed that the project children have grown according to their age level, these gains cannot be ascertained in measurable terms

without the actual CRT pre and post test score data. The lack of "release time" for the psychologist to score the tests and report the results has been cited as the major reason for this deficiency. Nevertheless, the CRT pre and post test score data remains the major measure of perceptual, motor and verbal skill gains by program children. It is, therefore, recommended that sufficient "release time" be provided to the authorized persons to interpret those test scores that can provide special insights into the full extent of progress achieved and are therefore of great interest to parents, project staff, and the entire D.C. Public Schools System.

9.) LECOPP made an impressive presentation at the D.C. Public Schools "1976 Bicentennial Expo." The presentation was refreshing and highly informative, especially to those persons interested in positive aspects of their schools' activities. Publicity for innovative programs such as LECOPP through media and public displays is an excellent public relations effort. It is, therefore, recommended that the project staff make use of every opportunity to publicly display the salient aspect of the program through all the available channels of communications.

10.) The LECOPP program provides parents with a sense of personal worth and belonging, and relieves the tension and monotony of being shut away from the rest of the world at home. For many parents LECOPP is the only community function to which they contribute. It is, therefore, recommended that LECOPP should provide an increasingly greater opportunity for parents to cooperate in community activities.

discuss problems and issues that confront them, take leadership in small community projects, and above all, to educate their youngsters. It is further recommended that at least one or two social events be arranged during the academic year to give parents the opportunity to demonstrate their artistic, home-making, cooking and other talents.

11.) Most classroom instruction was conducted in small groups whose schedule of activities was properly sequenced and oriented toward the development of affective and psychomotor, as well as cognitive domains. Problem solving techniques were also used in the LECOPP project. Parents worked as far as possible on a one-to-one basis with children. Discipline was superb, and student interest was unquestionably high. The training program for the parents was adequate, providing them with sufficient skill to deal with their children in a beneficial way. It is, therefore, recommended that the present schedule of activities be maintained, and that parental involvement be continued. Well organized training programs for both parents and other project staff will be a welcome addition to the program.

12.) Children from urban schools, surrounded by huge office buildings and dilapidated tenements, often have only limited exposure to the natural environment. Television is a major source of information that gives a distorted view of the natural condition of man and his environment. The urban child is apt to have a limited understanding of the outer

world. Very little provision in LECOPP has been made for educational trips that open up the thinking and feeling of children to the real world, nature and its wonders. The Washington area, unlike many American cities, has many neighboring areas supportive of interesting natural habitats, such as the extension of the C & O Canal area into Maryland and parkland regions in Southern Maryland. It is, therefore, recommended that sufficient monies be allocated in the budget for out-of-town field trips for children and their parents. Field trips can broaden the limited viewpoints of children growing up under limited circumstances.

In conclusion, the evaluators felt that LECOPP is a meaningful program that not only should be continued, but should be introduced into other schools as well. The program lacks adequate publicity and proper recognition within the school system. Not only were parents given a sense of belonging and responsibility in the education of their own children, but the instructional staff also had an opportunit to become further acquainted with the educational needs of children and adults in the school community so that they might meet those needs through simpler and more effective means. It is the finding of this study that LECOPP has largely achieved its stated objectives.

Appendix A

EVALUATION OF THE
LENOX EARLY CHILDHOOD OUTREACH PROGRAM FOR PARENTS,
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(Direction: This questionnaire may be read to parents by the LECOPP teacher if they experience any difficulty and assist them to complete).

1. Parent's Name (Optional)_____

2. Which is the nearest public elementary school to your home?

_____ _____

3. How long have you been working with LECOPP? _____ _____
Years Months

4. How many of your children are now in the LECOPP?_____

5. Who referred you to LECOPP?_____

6. Which of the following skills did LECOPP provide you with? (Check as many as appropriate)

_____Developing teaching aids.

_____Games and plays for children.

_____Team work with other parents and teachers

_____Learning child behavior

_____Arranging group functions

_____ Teaching Activities

_____Disciplining children

_____Singing Songs

_____Other (Please list)

_____

_____

7. What do you like most about LECOPP? _____

_____

_____

8. Are there things which you would like changed?_____

_____

9. Please check any of the changes that you have noted in your children since they started with LECOP:

___ Answer questions faster
___ Observe things more
___ More active
___ Dances to rhythms
___ Plays with other children
___ Speaks in complete sentence
___ Recognizes shapes
___ Completes puzzles
___ Sings Songs
___ Ask inquisitive questions
___ Finds solutions to own problems
___ Obeys better
___ Understands problems better
___ Good tablemanners
___ Does coloring well
___ Interested in school
___ Recognizes colors
___ Understands the names of different parts of the body.
___ Runs faster
___ Learned more words
___ Does not depend upon me as much
___ Other (Please list)

_____

10. How would you rate the following elements of LECOPP in view of your experience with the program this year? (Please circle one)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1. Parental training	5	4	3	2	1
2. LECOPP Teacher/ Coordinator	5	4	3	2	1
3. LECOPP Director	5	4	3	2	1
4. LECOPP Tutor/Secretary	5	4	3	2	1

Question No.10 (Contd...)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
5. Space	5	4	3	2	1
6. Instructional Materials	5	4	3	2	1
7. Parental Involvement	5	4	3	2	1
8. Home visits by LECOPP Teacher	5	4	3	2	1
9. Parent-teacher cooperation	5	4	3	2	1
10. Team work	5	4	3	2	1
11. Community involvement	5	4	3	2	1
12. Teacher Aides	5	4	3	2	1
13. Field Trips	5	4	3	2	1
14. Food	5	4	3	2	1
15. Daily schedule of activities	5	4	3	2	1
16. Other (specify)	5	4	3	2	1

_____

_____

11. What recommendations do you have to improve the program?_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Other comments, if any (Use other side if necessary)_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

EVALUATION OF THE
LENOX EARLY CHILDHOOD OUTREACH PROGRAM FOR PARENTS
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER/TEACHER AIDE/DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name (optional)_____

2. Teacher _____ Teacher Aide_____ Director _____(Check one)

3. How long have you been working with LECOPP? _____ Years _____ Months

4. How would you rate the following aspects of LECOPP Program? (Circle one each)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Aver.	Poor
a. Parental involvement	5	4	3	2	1
b. Parental interest	5	4	3	2	1
c. Community participation	5	4	3	2	1
d. Teacher-parent cooperation	5	4	3	2	1
e. Materials and supplies	5	4	3	2	1
f. Parent training	5	4	3	2	1
g. Home visitation	5	4	3	2	1
h. Daily schedule of activities	5	4	3	2	1
i. Facilities	5	4	3	2	1

5. To what extent have the students in LECOPP program improved in the following areas?

	Great extent	Great extent	Medium extent	No extent
a) Vocabulary		3	2	1
b) Understanding problems		3	2	1
c) Asking sensible questions		3	2	1
d) Cooperating with others		3	2	1
e) Physical activities in school		3	2	1
f) Personal manners		3	2	1
g) Discipline in the class		3	2	1
h) Color recognition		3	2	1
i) Number recognition		3	2	1
j) Shape recognition		3	2	1
k) Singing songs		3	2	1
l) Dancing to rhythm		3	2	1
m) Finding own solutions to problems		3	2	1
n) Observing things and events		3	2	1
o) Relating stories or incidents		3	2	1
p) Good table manners		3	2	1
q) Language		3	2	1
r) Playing new games		3	2	1
s) Understand directions for classroom activities		3	2	1
t) Attitude toward school		3	2	1
u) Interest in coming to school		3	2	1
v) Overall development of the child		3	2	1
w) Other (specify)_____				

6. In general, how do you rate the instructional materials the parents have developed for their children? (Check one)

Excellent_____ Average_____ Poor_____

7. Would you recommend that the program be continued beyond this year? YES_____ NO_____

Please state your reason(s) for your answer:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. What are some of the main features of the program that you like?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Other recommendations or comments that you may have:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix C

DEVELOPMENTAL CHECKLIST

GROSS MOTOR DEVELOPMENT (stop when child misses 2)

Runs
Climbs up and down stairs alone
Stands on one foot momentarily
Walks a straight line
Hops
Uses alternate feet on stairs
Catches and throws beanbag
Skips
Bounces Ball

FINE MOTOR DEVELOPMENT (stop when child misses 2)

Towers 6 - 7 blocks
Strings 3 beads
Imitates block bridge
Imitates primitive circle
Imitates cross
Imitates square

LANGUAGE AND CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT (stop when child misses 2)

Joins 2 - 3 words
Names 3 - 5 pictures
Gives full name and sex (boy, girl)
Uses sentences
Names 3 - 5 pictures by use
Rote counts to five
Counts five objects

PERCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT (stop when child misses 2)

Sorts blocks of 2 colors according to color
Sorts blocks of 2 sizes (large and small) according to size
Follows two commands
Sorts squares and circles according to shape
Sorts blocks of three colors according to color
Matches three colors
Follows three commands

ABBREVIATED HENDERSON ENVIRONMENTAL LEARNING PROCESS SCALE
(Factors II and IV, which account for most of the variance in intellectual performance)

C. VALUING LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL RELATED BEHAVIOR	NEVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
How often do you read the newspaper?			
How often do you explain to your child what steps must come first, second and so on, in doing some tasks?			
How often do you tell your child that he/she has behaved well?			
How often does your child play house?			
How much do you talk with your child at mealtime?			

PROVIDING A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR SCHOOL LEARNING

How often do you tell friends or family members about some clever thing your child has said?			
How often does your child see you reading a book?			
How often do you ask your child about what he/she is doing while he/she is playing?			